

1 Stephen M. Harris , Esq. (State Bar Number: 110626)
2 email: stephen@smh-legal.com
3 LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN M. HARRIS, P.C.
4 6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1500
5 Woodland Hills, California 91367
6 Telephone: (818) 924-3103
7 Facsimile: (818) 924-9079

8 Robert L. Starr, Esq. (State Bar Number: 183052)
9 email: robert@starrlaw.com
10 Adam M. Rose, Esq. (State Bar Number: 210880)
11 email: adam@starrlaw.com
12 THE LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT L. STARR, APC
13 23277 Ventura Boulevard
14 Woodland Hills, California 91364
15 Telephone: (818) 225-9040
16 Facsimile: (818) 225-9042

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff
18 TRISH HERREMANS, individually, and on behalf
19 of a class of similarly situated individuals

20
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22
23 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - WESTERN DIVISION

24
25 TRISH HERREMANS, individually, and
26 on behalf of a class of similarly situated
27 individuals,

28 Plaintiff,

v.

BMW OF NORTH AMERICA, LLC,

Defendant.

} NO. CV14-2363 MMM(PJWx)

} Assigned for All Purposes to
the Honorable George H. Wu

} Date: November 28, 2016
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Ctrm: 10

}
} NOTICE OF MOTION AND
} MOTION FOR FINAL
} APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
} SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM
} OF POINTS AND AUTHORITES

28 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:
29 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on November 28, 2016, at 10:00 a.m., or as
30 soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Courtroom 10 of the above-entitled

1 Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Plaintiff Trish
2 Herremans ("Plaintiff" or "Herremans") will and hereby do move this Count,
3 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23 for an Order finally approving
4 the class action settlement agreed to by the parties in this matter.

5 This Motion is based upon: (1) this Notice of Motion and Motion; (2) the
6 attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Final
7 Approval of Class Action Settlement; (3) the Declaration of Stephen M. Harris; the
8 Declaration of Jennifer McNulty, the declaration of Ann Haan, the declaration of
9 Plaintiff; (4) the [Proposed] Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action
10 Settlement, filed concurrently herewith; (5) the records, pleadings, and papers filed
11 in this action; and (6) upon such other documentary and oral evidence or argument as
12 may be presented to the Count at the hearing of this Motion.

13 This motion was not preceded by a meet and confer conference with defense
14 counsel pursuant to Local Rule 7-3 since Defendant does not oppose the motion.

15 Dated: November 7, 2016

LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN M. HARRIS,
16 P.C.

17 By: /s/ Stephen M. Harris

18
19 Stephen M. Harris
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21 TRISH HERREMANS,
individually, and on behalf of a class
of similarly situated individuals

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2 **TABLES OF CONTENTS**
3

1	I. INTRODUCTION	4
2	II. FACTS AND PROCEDURE	5
3	A. Named Plaintiff's Purchase of a Class Vehicle 4 with Water Pump Defect.....	5
5	B. Class Members Similar Experience.....	6
6	C. Plaintiff's Allegations in FAC Regarding the 7 Water Pump Defect.....	7
7	D. The Class Action Complaint Against BMW	9
8	E. The Mediation/Settlement Agreement.....	10
9	F. Preliminary Approval	11
10	G. Investigation And Discovery	11
11	H. The Settlement	13
12	1. The Settlement Class	13
13	2. The Payment and Reimbursement Schedule	14
14	3. The Notice to the Class and Others of the 15 Settlement	14
15	4. The Release of the Class.....	15
16	5. Claims Administration/Notice	15
17	III. ARGUMENT	16
18	A. The Court Should Approve The Settlement As 19 Fair, Reasonable And Adequate	16
20	1. The Settlement and the Substantial Benefits It 21 Provides to the Class Support Final Approval.....	18
22	2. The Risks Inherent In Continued Litigation 23 And Trial Support Final Approval	19
24	3. The Settlement Eliminates Any Risk of 25 Maintaining Class Action Status Throughout the Trial.....	21
26	4. The Extent of Discovery and the Stage of the 27 Proceedings Favor Settlement Approval.	22
28	5. The Recommendations of Experienced Counsel Favor Approval of the Settlement.....	22

1	5.	No Attorneys General Object to the	
	Settlement.....		23
2	6.	Class Members' Positive Reaction Supports	
3	Final Approval.....		23
4	IV. CONCLUSION.....		24
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1
2 Table Of Cases

3	<i>Acosta v. Trans Union, LLC</i> , 243 F.R.D. 377 (C.D.Cal.2007).....	20
4	<i>American Honda Motor Co., Inc. v. Superior Court</i> , 199 Cal. App. 4th 1367 (2011).....	20
5	<i>Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.</i> , 2007 WL 4105971 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2007)..... passim	
6	<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> 955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992)	16
7	<i>Daniel v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 2013 WL 3146810 (E.D. Cal. June 18 2013).....	17
8	<i>Daugherty v. American Honda Motor Co.</i> , 144 Cal. App. 4th 824 (Cal. Ct. App. 2006).....	18, 19
9		
10	<i>Edwards v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 2012 WL 2866424 (S.D Cal. June 12, 2012).	19
11	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9 th Cir. 2003),.....	15, 18, 21, 22
12	<i>Hartless v. Clorox Co.</i> , 273 F.R.D. 630 (S.D. 2011).....	21
13	<i>Henderson v. Volvo Cars a/North America</i> , Case No. 09-4146-CC CJAD (D.N. 2012)	17
14		
15	<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrand Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 928133 (N.D. Cal. 2009).....	17
16	<i>In re Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.</i> , 288 F.3d 1012 (7th Cir. 2002).....	19
17	<i>In Re General Motors Dex-Cool Products Liability Litigation</i> , 241 F.R.D. 305 (S.D.Ill.2007)	19
18	<i>In re Netflix Privacy Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 1120801 (N.D. Cal. March 18, 2013)	22
19		
20	<i>Marcus v. BMW of N. Am., LLC</i> , 2012 WL 3171560 (3d Cir., August 7, 2012)	22
21	<i>Mazza v. American Honda Motor Co.</i> , 666 F.3d 581 (9 th Cir.2012)	20
22		
23	<i>Nat'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.</i> , 221 F.R.D. 5236 (C.D. Cal. 2004).....	16
24	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n of City & Cnty. of San Francisco</i> , 668 F.2d 615 (9 th Cir. 1982)	15
25		
26	<i>Samuel-Bassett v. Kia Motors America, Inc.</i> , 34 A.3d 1 (Penn. 2011)	17,19
27	<i>Satchell v. Fed: Exp. Corp.</i> , 2007 WL 1114010 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2007)	22
28	<i>Staton v. Boeing</i> , 327 F.3d 938 (9 th Cir.2003).....	15

1	<i>United States v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 421 F. Supp. 1239 (D.D.C. 1976).....	5
2	<i>United States v. General Motors Corp.</i> , 417 F. Supp. 933 (D.D.C. 1976).....	5
3	<i>US. v. General Motors Corp.</i> , 518 F.2d 420 (C.A.D.C. 1975).....	5
4	<u>Statutes</u>	
5	Federal Rule Civil Procedure 23(e).....	15
6	<u>Treatises</u>	
7	4 NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS (4th ed.).....	16

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

L.

INTRODUCTION

4 Herremans brings this action on behalf of a nationwide class of current and
5 former owners and lessees of certain Mini Cooper Vehicles, with a production date
6 from October of 2006 through November of 2012, which were distributed by BMW
7 of North America, LLC (“BMW”). She alleges that defects in the design,
8 manufacture, and assembly of mechanical water pumps installed in the class vehicles
9 resulted in the engine overheating and potential catastrophic engine failure of the
10 Class Vehicles. Plaintiff further alleges that the water pump failure is due to the
11 sealed two roll ball bearing system installed in the mechanical water pumps (“Water
12 Pump Defect”) (Docket No. 58-5, Fourth Amended Complaint [“FAC”] ¶¶ 4-8.)

13 Plaintiff and BMW settled the nationwide class claims and the court granted
14 preliminary approval of the settlement on March 18, 2016. As part of the settlement,
15 BMW has agreed to reimburse all class members who have, or will, incur costs in
16 connection with repairing or replacing failed mechanical water pumps. BMW's
17 obligations are based upon the payment and reimbursement provisions of the
18 Agreement, more fully described below and in the Agreement attached as exhibit 1.
19 (See, Exhibit 1 to Harris Declaration).

20 Plaintiff now moves for final approval of the settlement. The settlement
21 provides Class Members with remedies similar to what they could expect to receive
22 if the case were successfully tried, but without the delay and risks associated with
23 trial, and it should therefore be approved.

24 The claims administrator mailed notice to 594,091 potential class members,
25 and states that there have been to date 4,883 claims which have been received, with
26 2,141 found to be in good order to pay. These 2,141 claims have an award value of
27 \$1,006,931.20. There are 2,741 claims which are not yet deemed in good order. The
28 value of these claims, assuming a claim value of 470.31, is \$1,289,116.49. To date,